

Complete roughness and conductivity corrections for the recent Casimir force measurement

G. L. Klimchitskaya,^{1,*} Anushree Roy,² U. Mohideen,^{2,†} and
V. M. Mostepanenko^{1,‡}

¹ *Physics Department, Federal University of Paraíba, C.P.5008,
CEP 58059-970, João Pessoa, Pb—Brazil*

² *Department of Physics, University of California, Riverside,
California 92521*

PACS numbers: 12.20.Fv, 42.50.Lc, 61.16.Ch

Abstract

We consider detailed roughness and conductivity corrections to the Casimir force in the recent Casimir force measurement employing an atomic force microscope. The roughness of the test bodies — a metal plate and a sphere — was investigated with the AFM and the SEM respectively. It consists of separate crystals of different heights and a stochastic background. The amplitude of roughness relative to the zero roughness level was determined and the corrections to the Casimir force were calculated up to the fourth order in a small parameter (which is this amplitude divided by the distance between the two test bodies). Also the corrections due to finite conductivity were found up to the fourth order in relative penetration depth of electromagnetic zero point oscillations into the metal. The theoretical result for the configuration of a sphere above a plate taking into account both corrections is in excellent agreement with the measured Casimir force.

I INTRODUCTION

The Casimir effect [1] which arises in bounded regions and in spaces with non-trivial topology is of great interest to specialists in the most diverse fields of physics — from statistical and atomic physics to elementary particle physics

*On leave from North-West Polytechnical Institute, St.Petersburg, Russia. Electronic address: galina@GK1372.spb.edu

†Electronic address: umar.mohideen@ucr.edu

‡On leave from A.Friedmann Laboratory for Theoretical Physics, St.Petersburg, Russia. Electronic address: mostep@fisica.ufpb.br

and cosmology. It explores the dependence of the vacuum polarization on the geometrical parameters of the quantization domain, leading to attractive and repulsive forces acting between the boundaries (see the review papers [2, 3] and the monographs [4, 5]).

A considerable amount of recent attention has been focussed on experimental verification of the Casimir force law between metallic surfaces. The first experiment of this kind was performed more than forty years ago [6] and provided qualitative confirmation of the Casimir prediction. Then over a period of years the force between dielectric test bodies was used to measure the Casimir force (see, e.g., [7, 8] and the other references in [4, 5]). During this period only one paper may be cited [9] where the Casimir force between the plate and the spherical lens covered by Chromium layers was measured. It should be noted that Chromium is a poor reflector for a large portion of the measured distances. In this paper, considerable attention has been given to the finite conductivity corrections to the Casimir force. Also the possible corrections due to surface roughness were discussed qualitatively. In all the earlier experiments only variants of the spring balance were used to measure the force.

In the paper [10] which opens the modern stage of the Casimir force measurements between metals the distance range from $0.6\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ to $6\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ was investigated. The test bodies were *Cu* plus *Au* coated quartz optical flat, and a spherical lens. The torsion pendulum was used to measure the Casimir force. As mentioned in [10], experimental data does not support the presence of finite conductivity corrections which are negative and can achieve 20% of the net Casimir force at the closest spacing. The roughness corrections which can achieve 20–30% of the net result if there are deviations of the interacting surfaces from the perfect shape [11] were not investigated in [10]. As discussed in [10] also, the data is not of sufficient accuracy to demonstrate the finite temperature corrections. We would like to remind that the temperature correction at room temperature is of 129% and 174% of the net force when the space separation is correspondingly $5\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ and $6\text{ }\mu\text{m}$. The values of both the Casimir force and

temperature correction to it at such distances are of the order of 10^{-12} N. Their experimental measurement and investigation is the unresolved problem of paramount importance.

In the paper [12] an Atomic Force Microscope (AFM) was used to make a precision measurement of the Casimir force between a sphere and a flat plate covered by the *Al* and *Au/Pd* layers. The measurements were done for plate-sphere separations between $0.1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ to $0.9\text{ }\mu\text{m}$. The experimental data was shown to be consistent with the theoretical calculations including the finite conductivity and roughness corrections calculated up to the second order in appropriate parameters [13]. No account has been taken in these calculations of the specific shape of roughness peculiar to the test bodies in use. Also the third and fourth orders of these corrections were neglected although they could contribute to the comparison of the theory and experiment at an accuracy level of 1% for the smallest separations (temperature corrections are not important in this distance range).

Other techniques for measuring the Casimir force have also been proposed (see, e.g., [14, 15]).

Here we present the complete experimental and theoretical investigation of the surface roughness and roughness corrections to the Casimir force in the experiment [12]. For this purpose the roughness of the plate was measured with the AFM and the roughness of the sphere — by the Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM). The surface is composed of large separate crystals situated irregularly on the surface. They are modeled by parallelepipeds of two different heights situated on the stochastic background. The corresponding corrections to the Casimir force are computed by the use of the approximate method proposed earlier in [16, 17]. The corrections due to roughness up to the fourth order in relative roughness amplitude are obtained.

To provide the higher order finite conductivity corrections the measurement range is subdivided into ranges of small and large distances. It is shown that at small distances it is possible to neglect the external *Au/Pd* cap layer. At

large distances the effective penetration depth of the electromagnetic zero point oscillations into the metal is found. As a result the corrections due to finite conductivity up to the fourth order are calculated taking into account the effect of the surface roughness.

The resulting Casimir force with both corrections is in excellent agreement with the experimental data.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II the necessary details of the experiment [12] are reviewed. Sec. III contains a brief formulation of the perturbative approach to the calculation of roughness corrections. In Sec. IV the investigation of surface roughness and the roughness corrections is presented in relation to the experiment [12]. Sec. V is devoted to the corrections due to the finite conductivity of the metals. Here, the final expressions for the Casimir force including both corrections are also obtained. In Sec. VI they are compared with the experimental data of [12]. Sec. VII contains conclusions and discussion.

Throughout the paper units in which $\hbar = c = 1$ are used.

II THE MEASUREMENT OF THE CASIMIR FORCE

In Ref. [12] a standard AFM was used to measure the force between a metallized sphere and flat plate at a pressure of 50 mTorr and at room temperature. Polystyrene spheres of $200 \pm 4 \mu\text{m}$ diameter were mounted on the tip of $300 \mu\text{m}$ long cantilevers with *Ag* epoxy. A 1.25 cm diameter optically polished sapphire disk was used as the plate. The cantilever (with sphere) and plate were then coated with 300 nm of *Al* in an evaporator. Aluminum is used because of its high reflectivity for wavelengths (sphere-plate separations) $> 100 \text{ nm}$. Both surfaces were then coated with less than 20 nm layer of 60%*Au*/40%*Pd*. The sphere diameter was measured using the SEM to be $196.0 \pm 0.5 \mu\text{m}$.

In the AFM, the force on a cantilever is measured by the deflection of its tip. A laser beam is reflected off the cantilever tip to measure its deflection. A force on the sphere would result in a cantilever deflection leading to a difference

signal between photodiodes A and B (shown in Fig. 1). This force and the corresponding cantilever deflection are related by Hooke's law: $F = k\Delta z$, where k is the force constant and Δz is the cantilever deflection. The piezo extension with applied voltage was calibrated with height standards and its hysteresis was measured. The corrections due to the piezo hysteresis (2% linear correction) and cantilever deflection (discussed in [12]) were applied to the sphere-plate separations in all collected data.

To measure the Casimir force between the sphere and the plate they are grounded together with the AFM. The plate is then moved towards the sphere in 3.6 nm steps and the corresponding photodiode difference signal was measured (approach curve). The signal obtained for a typical scan is shown in Fig. 2. Here “0” separation stands for contact of the sphere and plate surfaces. It does not take into account the absolute average separation between the *Au/Pd* layers due to the surface roughness which is about 80 nm (see Sec. IV). If one also takes into account the *Au/Pd* cap layers which are transparent at small separations (see Sec. V) the absolute average separation at contact between *Al* layers is about 120 nm. Region 1 shows that the force curve at large separations is dominated by a linear signal. This is due to increased coupling of scattered light into the diodes from the approaching flat surface. Embedded in the signal is a long range attractive electrostatic force from the contact potential difference between the sphere and plate, and the Casimir force (small at such large distances). In region 2 (absolute separations vary from contact to 350 nm) the Casimir force is the dominant characteristic far exceeding all the systematic errors. Region 3 is the flexing of the cantilever resulting from the continued extension of the piezo after contact of the two surfaces. Given the distance moved by the flat plate (x -axis), the difference signal of the photodiodes can be calibrated to a cantilever deflection in nanometers using the slope of the curve in region 3.

Next, the force constant of the cantilever was calibrated by an electrostatic measurement. The sphere was grounded to the AFM and different voltages in the range ± 0.5 V to ± 3 V were applied to the plate. The force between a

charged sphere and plate is given as [18]

$$F = 2\pi\epsilon_0(V_1 - V_2)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{csch} n\alpha (\coth \alpha - n \coth n\alpha). \quad (1)$$

Here V_1 is the applied voltage on the plate, V_2 represents the residual potential on the grounded sphere, and ϵ_0 is the permittivity of free space. One more notation is $\alpha = \cosh^{-1}(1 + a/R)$, where R is the radius of the sphere and a is the separation between the sphere and the plate. From the difference in force for voltages $\pm V_1$ applied to the plate, we can measure the residual potential on the grounded sphere V_2 as 29 mV. This residual potential is a contact potential that arises from the different materials used to ground the sphere. The electrostatic force measurement was repeated at 5 different separations and for 8 different voltages V_1 . Using Hooke's law and the force from Eq. (1), we measure the force constant of the cantilever k . The average of all the measured k is 0.0182 N/m.

The systematic error corrections to the force curve of Fig. 2, due to the residual potential on the sphere and the true separations between the two surfaces, are now calculated. Here the near linear force curve in region 1, is fit to a function of the form: $F = F_c(a + a_0) + B/(a + a_0) + C \times (a + a_0) + E$. Here a_0 is the absolute separation at contact, which is constrained to 120 ± 5 nm, is the only unknown to be completely obtained by the fit. The second term represents the inverse linear dependence of the electrostatic force between the sphere and plate for $R \gg a$ as given by Eq. (1). The constant $B = -2.8$ nN·nm corresponding to $V_2 = 29$ mV and $V_1 = 0$ in Eq. (1) is used. The third term represents the linearly increasing coupling of the scattered light into the photodiodes and E is the offset of the curve. Both C and E can be estimated from the force curve at large separations. The best fit values of C , E and the absolute space separation a_0 are determined by minimizing the χ^2 . The finite conductivity correction and roughness correction (the largest corrections) do not play a significant role in the region 1 (see Sec. VI) and thus the value of a_0 determined by the fitting is unbiased with respect to these corrections. These values of C , E and a_0 are then used to subtract the systematic errors from the force curve in region 1 and

2 to obtain the measured Casimir force as $(F_c)_m = F_m - B/a - Ca - E$, where F_m is the measured total force.

This procedure is repeated for 26 scans in different locations of the flat plate. The average measured Casimir force $(F_c)_m$ as a function of sphere-plate separations from all the scans is shown in Figs. 4,5 below as open squares.

III ROUGHNESS CORRECTIONS TO THE CASIMIR FORCE

For distances of $a \sim 1 \mu\text{m}$ between the interacting bodies the surface roughness makes an important contribution to the value of the Casimir force. Although the exact calculation of roughness contribution is impossible, one can find the corresponding corrections approximately with the required accuracy. In the case of stochastic roughness the corrections to the van der Waals and Casimir forces were first calculated in [19] up to the second order in relative roughness dispersions (the fourth order corrections were obtained in [20]). Effects of large-scale surface roughness on only the non-retarded van der Waals force were investigated in [21, 22].

The method of greatest practical utility is the summation of retarded interatomic potentials over all atoms of two bodies distorted by roughness with a subsequent multiplicative normalization of the interaction coefficient [16, 17]

$$U(a) = -\frac{CN_1N_2}{K} \int_{V_1} d\mathbf{r}_1 \int_{V_2} d\mathbf{r}_2 |\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|^{-7}. \quad (2)$$

Here $N_{1,2}$ are the numbers of atoms per unit volume of the bodies, C is the constant of the retarded van der Waals interaction, K is a special normalization constant, a is a distance between bodies.

The appropriate choice of the normalization constant K gives the possibility of increasing the accuracy of additive summation. Its value can be found as a ratio of the additive and exact potentials for the configuration admitting the

exact solution. For two plane parallel plates, as an example most important for experiment,

$$K = \frac{CN_1N_2}{\Psi(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)} > 1, \quad (3)$$

where the Ψ is defined as [23]

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) = \frac{5}{16\pi^3} \int_0^\infty \int_1^\infty \frac{x^3}{p^2} \left\{ \left[\frac{(s_1 + p)(s_2 + p)}{(s_1 - p)(s_2 - p)} e^x - 1 \right]^{-1} \right. \\ \left. + \left[\frac{(s_1 + p\varepsilon_1)(s_2 + p\varepsilon_2)}{(s_1 - p\varepsilon_1)(s_2 - p\varepsilon_2)} e^x - 1 \right]^{-1} \right\} dp dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here, $s_{1,2} = (\varepsilon_{1,2} - 1 + p^2)^{1/2}$, and $\varepsilon_{1,2}$ are the static dielectric permittivities of the plate materials.

From (2) and (3) the Casimir force is

$$F = -\frac{\partial U}{\partial a}, \quad U(a) = -\Psi(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \int_{V_1} d\mathbf{r}_1 \int_{V_2} d\mathbf{r}_2 |\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|^{-7}. \quad (5)$$

For the configuration of two plane parallel plates, Eq. (5) is exact by construction. We use here the word “exact” implying that the approximative method does not bring any additional error. Actually, the so called “exact” results are obtained in the approximation of large distances with the proviso that $a \gg \lambda_0$, where λ_0 is the characteristic wavelength of absorption spectra. At the same time the values of a must satisfy the condition $aT \ll 1$, where T is a temperature measured in energy units. For two plates or a plate and a lens or a sphere of large curvature radius covered by roughness the relative error of the results obtained by (5) does not exceed $10^{-2}\%$ [17] (this is proved under the supposition that the roughness amplitude A is much smaller than a). Because of this the proposed method is very useful for the calculation of roughness contribution in experiments on the Casimir force.

Recently, other methods for approximative calculation of the Casimir force have been proposed. Among them the semiclassical [24] and macroscopic [25] approaches are applicable to the case of a sphere near a wall. They do not take into account the surface roughness. Also the path-integral approach was

suggested [26] to study the space and time deformations of the perfectly reflecting boundaries. It was applied to describe the model example of corrugated plates when the lateral component of the Casimir force arises.

Now consider a plane plate (disk) of dimension $2L$, thickness D and a sphere above it of radius R both covered by roughness. The roughness on the plate is described by the function

$$z_1^{(s)} = A_1 f_1(x_1, y_1), \quad (6)$$

where the value of amplitude is chosen in such a way that $\max |f_1(x_1, y_1)| = 1$. It is suitable to fix the zero point in the z axis by the condition

$$\langle z_1^{(s)} \rangle = A_1 \langle f_1(x_1, y_1) \rangle \equiv \frac{A_1}{4L^2} \int_{-L}^L dx_1 \int_{-L}^L dy_1 f_1(x_1, y_1) = 0. \quad (7)$$

The roughness on the sphere is most conveniently described in the polar coordinates

$$z_2^{(s)} = a + R - \sqrt{R^2 - \rho^2} + A_2 f_2(\rho, \varphi). \quad (8)$$

The value of the amplitude is chosen as specified above. The value of R in Eq. (8) is defined in such a way that $\langle f_2(\rho, \varphi) \rangle = 0$.

The potential U from Eq. (5) for configuration of a plate and a sphere with roughness described by (6), (8) can be represented as

$$U(a) = -\Psi(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^R \rho d\rho \int_{z_2^{(s)}}^{a+2R} dz_2 U_A(\rho, \varphi, z_2), \quad (9)$$

where

$$U_A(\rho, \varphi, z_2) = \int_{-L}^L dx_1 \int_{-L}^L dy_1 \int_{-D}^{z_1^{(s)}} \frac{dz_1}{[(x_1 - \rho \sin \varphi)^2 + (y_1 - \rho \cos \varphi)^2 + (z_1 - z_2)^2]^{\frac{7}{2}}}. \quad (10)$$

In Ref.[11] the perturbation theory was developed in small parameters $A_{1,2}/a$ based on Eqs. (5), (9), (10). All the results were obtained in the zeroth order of the parameters a/D , a/L , and a/R which are much smaller than $A_{1,2}/a$ (in

Ref.[13] it was shown that the corrections due to the finiteness of a plate are negligible). The perturbation expansion for the Casimir force is

$$F_R(a) = F_0(a) \sum_{k=0}^4 \sum_{l=0}^{4-k} C_{kl} \left(\frac{A_1}{a} \right)^k \left(\frac{A_2}{a} \right)^l, \quad (11)$$

where the force acting between the perfect plate and the sphere is

$$F_0(a) = -\Psi(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \frac{\pi^2 R}{15a^3}. \quad (12)$$

When the plate and the sphere are perfect metals we have the limiting case $\varepsilon_{1,2} \rightarrow \infty$, $\Psi \rightarrow \pi/24$ and Eq. (12) takes the form

$$F_0(a) = -\frac{\pi^3 R}{360a^3}. \quad (13)$$

The first coefficient of Eq. (11) is $C_{00} = 1$. The other coefficients were found in Ref.[11] for the configuration of a lens (sphere) above a plate and in Ref.[17] for two plane parallel plates. They are complicated integrals involving functions describing roughness. In the case that

$$d_p, d_s \ll \sqrt{aR}, \quad (14)$$

where d_p, d_s are the characteristic lateral sizes of distortions covering the plate and the sphere, the simple universal expression for the expansion coefficients of Eq.(11) can be obtained. As a result, Eq.(11) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} F_R(a) = F_0(a) \left\{ 1 + 6 \left[\langle\langle f_1^2 \rangle\rangle \left(\frac{A_1}{a} \right)^2 - 2 \langle\langle f_1 f_2 \rangle\rangle \frac{A_1}{a} \frac{A_2}{a} + \langle\langle f_2^2 \rangle\rangle \left(\frac{A_2}{a} \right)^2 \right] \right. \\ + 10 \left[\langle\langle f_1^3 \rangle\rangle \left(\frac{A_1}{a} \right)^3 - 3 \langle\langle f_1^2 f_2 \rangle\rangle \left(\frac{A_1}{a} \right)^2 \frac{A_2}{a} + 3 \langle\langle f_1 f_2^2 \rangle\rangle \frac{A_1}{a} \left(\frac{A_2}{a} \right)^2 \\ - \langle\langle f_2^3 \rangle\rangle \left(\frac{A_2}{a} \right)^3 \right] + 15 \left[\langle\langle f_1^4 \rangle\rangle \left(\frac{A_1}{a} \right)^4 - 4 \langle\langle f_1^3 f_2 \rangle\rangle \left(\frac{A_1}{a} \right)^3 \frac{A_2}{a} \right. \\ \left. \left. + 6 \langle\langle f_1^2 f_2^2 \rangle\rangle \left(\frac{A_1}{a} \right)^2 \left(\frac{A_2}{a} \right)^2 - 4 \langle\langle f_1 f_2^3 \rangle\rangle \frac{A_1}{a} \left(\frac{A_2}{a} \right)^3 + \langle\langle f_2^4 \rangle\rangle \left(\frac{A_2}{a} \right)^4 \right] \right\}. \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

Here the double angle brackets denote two successive averaging procedures. The first one is the averaging over the surface area of interacting bodies. The

second one is over all possible phase shifts between the distortions situated on the surfaces of interacting bodies against each other. This second averaging is necessary because in the experiment [12] the measured Casimir force was averaged over 26 scans (see Sec. II).

Note that under condition (14) the result (15) can be obtained in two ways: starting from the Eqs. (9), (10) for a sphere above a plate [11] and applying Force Proximity Theorem [27] to the Eq. (25) of Ref.[17] which is an analog of (15) for the configuration of two plane parallel plates. As one would expect, the results coincide (in the case of large-scale roughness violating the condition (14) the special redefinition of a distance is needed for the correct application of Force Proximity Theorem [13]).

IV INVESTIGATION OF THE SURFACE ROUGHNESS

Let us apply the result (15) to carefully calculate the roughness corrections to the Casimir force in the experiment [12]. The roughness of the metal surface was measured with the same AFM. After the Casimir force measurement the cantilever with sphere was replaced with a standard cantilever having a sharp tip. Regions of the metal plate differing in size from $1\,\mu\text{m} \times 1\,\mu\text{m}$ to $0.5\,\mu\text{m} \times 0.5\,\mu\text{m}$ were scanned with the AFM. A typical surface scan is shown in Fig. 3. The roughness of the sphere was investigated with a SEM and found to be similar to the flat plate. In the surface scan of Fig. 3, the lighter tone corresponds to larger height.

As is seen from Fig. 3 the major distortions are the large separate crystals situated irregularly on the surfaces. They can be modeled approximately by the parallelepipeds of two heights. As the analysis of several AFM images shows, the height of highest distortions is about $h_1 = 40\,\text{nm}$ and of the intermediate ones — about $h_2 = 20\,\text{nm}$. Almost all surface between the distortions is covered by the stochastic roughness of height $h_0 = 10\,\text{nm}$. It consists of small crystals which are not clearly visible in Fig.3 due to the vertical scale used. All together they

form the homogeneous background of the averaged height $h_0/2$. The character of roughness on the plate and on the lens is quite similar.

Now it is possible to determine the height H relative to which the middle value of the function, describing the total roughness, is zero. It can be found from the equation

$$(h_1 - H)S_1 + (h_2 - H)S_2 - \left(H - \frac{h_0}{2}\right)S_0 = 0, \quad (16)$$

where $S_{1,2,0}$ are, correspondingly, the surface areas occupied by distortions of the heights h_1 , h_2 and stochastic roughness. Dividing (16) into the area of interacting surface $S = S_1 + S_2 + S_0$ one gets

$$(h_1 - H)v_1 + (h_2 - H)v_2 - \left(H - \frac{h_0}{2}\right)v_0 = 0, \quad (17)$$

where $v_{1,2,0} = S_{1,2,0}/S$ are the relative parts of the surface occupied by the different kinds of roughness. The analysis of the AFM pictures similar to Fig. 3 gives us the values $v_1 = 0.11$, $v_2 = 0.25$, $v_0 = 0.64$. Solving Eq. (17) we get the height of the zero distortions level $H = 12.6$ nm. The value of distortion amplitude defined relatively to this level is

$$A = h_1 - H = 27.4 \text{ nm}. \quad (18)$$

Below two more parameters will also be used

$$\beta_1 = \frac{h_2 - H}{A} \approx 0.231, \quad \beta_2 = \frac{H - h_0/2}{A} \approx 0.346. \quad (19)$$

With the help of them the distortion function from (6) can be represented as

$$f_1(x_1, y_1) = \begin{cases} 1, & (x_1, y_1) \in \Sigma_{S_1}, \\ \beta_1, & (x_1, y_1) \in \Sigma_{S_2}, \\ -\beta_2, & (x_1, y_1) \in \Sigma_{S_0}, \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

where Σ_{S_1, S_2, S_0} are the regions of the first interacting body surface occupied by the different kinds of roughness.

The same representation is valid for f_2 also

$$f_2(x_2, y_2) = \begin{cases} -1, & (x_2, y_2) \in \tilde{\Sigma}_{S_1}, \\ -\beta_1, & (x_2, y_2) \in \tilde{\Sigma}_{S_2}, \\ \beta_2, & (x_2, y_2) \in \tilde{\Sigma}_{S_0}, \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

$\tilde{\Sigma}_{S_1, S_2, S_0}$ are the regions of the second interacting body surface occupied by the distortions of different kinds.

Note that the inequality (14) is easily satisfied. For the roughness under consideration the characteristic lateral sizes of distortions are $d_p, d_s \sim 200 - 300$ nm as can be seen from Fig. 3. At the same time $\sqrt{aR} > 3000$ nm. Thus, Eq. (15) is applicable for the calculation of roughness corrections.

Now it is not difficult to calculate the coefficients of expansion (15). One example is

$$\langle\langle f_1 f_2 \rangle\rangle = -v_1^2 - 2\beta_1 v_1 v_2 + 2\beta_2 v_1 v_0 - \beta_1^2 v_2^2 + 2\beta_1 \beta_2 v_2 v_0 - \beta_2^2 v_0^2 = 0, \quad (22)$$

which follows from Eqs. (17)–(19). The results for the other coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle f_1^2 \rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle f_2^2 \rangle\rangle = v_1 + \beta_1^2 v_2 + \beta_2^2 v_0, \\ \langle\langle f_1^3 \rangle\rangle &= -\langle\langle f_2^3 \rangle\rangle = v_1 + \beta_1^3 v_2 - \beta_2^3 v_0, \quad \langle\langle f_1 f_2^2 \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle f_1^2 f_2 \rangle\rangle = 0, \\ \langle\langle f_1^4 \rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle f_2^4 \rangle\rangle = v_1 + \beta_1^4 v_2 + \beta_2^4 v_0, \quad \langle\langle f_1 f_2^3 \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle f_1^3 f_2 \rangle\rangle = 0, \\ \langle\langle f_1^2 f_2^2 \rangle\rangle &= (v_1 + \beta_1^2 v_2 + \beta_2^2 v_0)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Substituting (23) into (15) we get the final expression for the Casimir force with surface distortions included upto the fourth order in relative distortion amplitude

$$\begin{aligned} F_R(a) = F_0(a) &\left\{ 1 + 12 (v_1 + \beta_1^2 v_2 + \beta_2^2 v_0) \frac{A^2}{a^2} \right. \\ &+ 20 (v_1 + \beta_1^3 v_2 - \beta_2^3 v_0) \frac{A^3}{a^3} \\ &\left. + 30 \left[v_1 + \beta_1^4 v_2 + \beta_2^4 v_0 + 3 (v_1 + \beta_1^2 v_2 + \beta_2^2 v_0)^2 \right] \frac{A^4}{a^4} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

It should be noted that exactly the same result can be obtained in a very simple way. To do this it is enough to calculate the values of the Casimir force (12) for six different distances which are possible between the distorted surfaces, multiply them by the appropriate probabilities and then to summarize the results

$$\begin{aligned}
 F_R(a) = \sum_{i=1}^6 w_i F_0(a_i) \equiv & v_1^2 F_0(a - 2A) \\
 & + 2v_1 v_2 F_0(a - A(1 + \beta_1)) + 2v_2 v_0 F_0(a - A(\beta_1 - \beta_2)) \\
 & + v_0^2 F_0(a + 2A\beta_2) + v_2^2 F_0(a - 2A\beta_1) + 2v_1 v_0 F_0(a - A(1 - \beta_2)).
 \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

The question arises of whether there is unique definition of the distance a between the interacting bodies in Eqs. (24), (25). This point is discussed in the next section in connection with the reflectivity properties of the metals covering the plate and the sphere.

V CORRECTIONS TO THE CASIMIR FORCE DUE TO FINITE CONDUCTIVITY OF THE METALS

The interacting bodies used in the experiment [12] were coated with 300 nm of Al in an evaporator. The thickness of this metallic layer is much larger than the penetration depth δ_0 of electromagnetic oscillations into Al for the wavelengths (sphere-plate separations) of interest. Taking $\lambda_p^{Al} = 100$ nm as the approximative value of the effective plasma wavelength of the electrons in Al [28] one gets $\delta_0 = \lambda_p^{Al}/(2\pi) \approx 16$ nm. What this means is the interacting bodies can be considered as made of Al as a whole. Although Al reflects more than 90% of the incident electromagnetic oscillations in the complete measurement range $100 \text{ nm} < \lambda < 950 \text{ nm}$, some corrections to the Casimir force due to the finiteness of its conductivity exist and should be taken into account. In addition, to prevent the oxidation processes, the surface of Al in [12] was covered with $\Delta = 20$ nm layer of 60% Au /40% Pd . The reflectivity properties of this alloy are much worse than of Al (the effective plasma wavelength of Au is $\lambda_p^{Au} = 500$ nm

and the penetration depth is $\tilde{\delta}_0 \approx 80$ nm). Because of this, it is impossible to use Eq. (13) to compare theory and experiment as it is only valid for ideal metals of infinite conductivity. It is necessary to take into account the finiteness of the metal conductivity.

Let us start our discussion with the large distances $a > \lambda_p^{Au}$ for which both *Al* and *Au/Pd* are the good metals. In this case the perturbation theory in the relative penetration depth can be developed. This small parameter is the ratio of an effective penetration depth δ_e (into both *Au/Pd* and *Al*) and a distance between the *Au/Pd* layers a . The quantity δ_e , in its turn, is understood as a depth for which the electromagnetic oscillations are attenuated by a factor of e . It takes into account both the properties of *Al* and of *Au/Pd* layers. The value of δ_e can be found from the equation

$$\frac{\Delta}{\tilde{\delta}_0} + \frac{\delta_e - \Delta}{\delta_0} = 1, \quad \delta_e = \left(1 - \frac{\Delta}{\tilde{\delta}_0}\right) \delta_0 + \Delta \approx 32 \text{ nm}. \quad (26)$$

The first order corrections to the Eq. (13) was found in [29, 30] for the configuration of two plane parallel plates. Together with the second order correction found in [31] the result is

$$F_{\delta_e}(a) = F_0(a) \left(1 - \frac{16}{3} \frac{\delta_e}{a} + 24 \frac{\delta_e^2}{a^2}\right). \quad (27)$$

From the general expression for F_{δ_e} it is seen that the Casimir force taking into account the finite conductivity is sign-constant for all δ_e and has a zero limit when $\delta_e \rightarrow \infty$. This gives the possibility to obtain the simple interpolation formula [31]

$$F_{\delta_e}(a) \approx F_0(a) \left(1 + \frac{11}{3} \frac{\delta_e}{a}\right)^{-16/11}. \quad (28)$$

From (28) we have the same result as in (27) for small δ_e/a , but it is applicable in the wider range $0 \leq \delta_e/a \leq 0.2$.

Let us now expand (28) in powers of δ_e/a up to the fourth order inclusive and modify the result by the use of Force Proximity Theorem [27] to the case

of a sphere above a plate

$$F_{\delta_e}(a) = F_0(a) \left(1 - 4 \frac{\delta_e}{a} + \frac{72}{5} \frac{\delta_e^2}{a^2} - \frac{152}{3} \frac{\delta_e^3}{a^3} + \frac{532}{3} \frac{\delta_e^4}{a^4} \right). \quad (29)$$

Here $F_0(a)$ is defined by (13).

Now we combine both corrections — one due to the surface roughness and the second due to the finite conductivity of the metals. For this purpose we substitute the quantity $F_{\delta_e}(a_i)$ from (29) into Eq. (25) instead of $F_0(a_i)$. The result is

$$F(a) = \sum_{i=1}^6 w_i F_{\delta_e}(a_i), \quad (30)$$

where different possible distances between the surfaces with roughness and their probabilities were introduced in (25). Eq. (30) along with (29) describes the Casimir force between *Al* bodies with *Au/Pd* layers taking into account the finite conductivity of the metals and surface roughness for the distances $a > \lambda_p^{Au}$. Note that (30) incorporates not only the corrections to the surface roughness and finite conductivity separately but also some “crossed” terms, i.e. the conductivity corrections to the roughness ones.

Unfortunately, the Eq. (30), strictly speaking, cannot be used for the distances $a < \lambda_p^{Au}$. The most rigorous way of calculating the Casimir force in this range is to apply the general Lifshitz theory without the supposition that a is much larger than the characteristic absorption band of *Au/Pd* (this supposition leads to the result (12) with a definition (4)). To do this the detailed information is needed concerning the behaviour of the dielectric permittivity of *Au/Pd* on the imaginary frequency axis. This information should reflect the absorption bands of the alloy and the damping of free electrons [9]. In doing so the actual dependence of the Casimir force on a could be calculated, where a is the distance between the outer *Au/Pd* layers.

At the same time, there exists a more simple, phenomenological, approach to calculation of the Casimir force for the distances less than the characteristic absorption wavelength of the *Au/Pd* covering. It uses the fact that the transmittance

of 20 nm Au/Pd films for the wavelength of around 300 nm is greater than 90%. This transmission measurement was made by taking the ratio of light transmitted through a glass slide with and without the Au/Pd coating in an optical spectrometer.

So high transmittance gives the possibility to neglect the Au/Pd layers when calculating the Casimir force and to enlarge the distance between the bodies by $2\Delta = 40$ nm when comparing the theoretical and experimental results. With this approach for the distances $a < \lambda_p^{Au}$, instead of (30), the following result is valid

$$F(a) = \sum_{i=1}^6 w_i F_{\delta_0}(a_i + 2\Delta), \quad (31)$$

where the Casimir force with account of finite conductivity is defined by the Eq. (29).

VI COMPARISON WITH THE EXPERIMENT

Let us first consider large surface separations (the distance between the Au/Pd layers changes in the interval $610 \text{ nm} \leq a \leq 910 \text{ nm}$). We compare the results given by (30) and (31) with experimental data. In Fig. 4 the dashed curve represents the results obtained by the Eq.(30), and solid curve — by the Eq.(31). The experimental points are shown as open squares. For eighty experimental points, which belong to the range of a under consideration, the root mean square average deviation between theory and experiment in both cases is $\sigma = 1.5 \text{ pN}$. It is notable that for the large a the same result is valid also if we use the Casimir force from Eq. (13) (i.e. without any corrections) both for a and for $a + 2\Delta$. By this is meant that for large a the problem of the proper definition of distance is not significant due to the large scatter in experimental points due to the experimental uncertainty. The same situation occurs with the corrections. At $a + 2\Delta = 950 \text{ nm}$ the correction due to roughness (positive) is of about 0.2% of F_0 and the correction due to finite conductivity (negative) is 6% of F_0 . Together they give the negative contribution which is also 6% of F_0 .

It is negligible if we take into account the relative error of force measurements at the extreme distance of 950 nm is approximately 660% (this is because the Casimir force is much less than the experimental uncertainty at such distances).

Now we consider the range of smaller values of the distance $80 \text{ nm} \leq a \leq 460 \text{ nm}$ (or, between Al , $120 \text{ nm} \leq a + 2\Delta \leq 500 \text{ nm}$). Here the Eq. (31) should be used for the Casimir force. In Fig. 5 the Casimir force $F_0(a + 2\Delta)$ from (13) is shown by the dashed curve. The solid curve represents the dependence calculated according to Eq. (31). The open squares are the experimental points. Taking into account all one hundred experimental points belonging to the range of smaller distances we get for the solid curve the value of the root mean square deviation between theory and experiment $\sigma_{100} = 1.5 \text{ pN}$. If we consider more narrow distance interval $80 \text{ nm} \leq a \leq 200 \text{ nm}$ which contains thirty experimental points it turns out that $\sigma_{30} = 1.6 \text{ pN}$ for the solid curve. In all the measurement range $80 \text{ nm} \leq a \leq 910 \text{ nm}$ the root mean square deviation for the solid curves of Figs. 4, 5 is $\sigma_{223} = 1.4 \text{ pN}$ (223 experimental points). What this means is that the dependence (31) gives equally good agreement with experimental data in the region of small distances (for the smallest ones the relative error of force measurement is about 1%), in the region of large distances (where the relative error is rather large) and in the whole measurement range. If one uses less sophisticated expressions for the corrections to the Casimir force due to the surface roughness and finite conductivity, the value of σ calculated for small a would be larger than in the whole range [12].

It is interesting to compare the obtained results with those given by Eq. (13), i.e. without account of any corrections. In this case for the interval $80 \text{ nm} \leq a \leq 460 \text{ nm}$ (one hundred experimental points) we have $\sigma_{100}^0 = 8.7 \text{ pN}$. For the whole measurement range $80 \text{ nm} \leq a \leq 910 \text{ nm}$ (223 points) there is $\sigma_{223}^0 = 5.9 \text{ pN}$. It is evident that without appropriate treatment of the corrections to the Casimir force the value of the root mean square deviation is not only larger but also depends significantly on the measurement range.

The comparative role of each correction is also quite obvious. If we take into

account only roughness correction according to Eq. (25), then one obtains for the root mean square deviation in different intervals: $\sigma_{30}^R = 22.8$ pN, $\sigma_{100}^R = 12.7$ pN and $\sigma_{223}^R = 8.5$ pN. At $a + 2\Delta = 120$ nm the correction is 17% of F_0 . For the single finite conductivity correction calculated by Eq. (29) with δ_0 instead of δ_e it follows: $\sigma_{30}^\delta = 5.2$ pN, $\sigma_{100}^\delta = 3.1$ pN and $\sigma_{223}^\delta = 2.3$ pN. At 120 nm this correction contributes -34% of F_0 . (Note, that both corrections contribute -22% of F_0 at 120 nm, so that their nonadditivity is demonstrated most clearly.)

Considering the case of small distances, we have neglected the contribution of thin Au/Pd layers which are almost transparent for the essential frequencies. The corrections to the Casimir force due to these layers can be calculated considering them as being made of some effective dielectric with a small permittivity ε [5]. Such corrections calculated with $\varepsilon \approx 1.1$ lead, together with (31), to the same value of σ if we increase the values of all distances by 1 nm. If the effective value of permittivity would be $\varepsilon \approx 1.2$ this is equivalent to addition of 3 nm to all the distances without changing of σ . As can well be imagined, the corrections due to Au/Pd layers are not essential when it is considered that the absolute uncertainty of distance measurements in the experiment [12] was about ± 5 nm.

VII CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

In the above, the surface roughness of the test bodies used in the experiment [12] on Casimir force measurement was investigated with the use of AFM and SEM. The corrections to this force due to both surface roughness and finite conductivity of the metal were calculated up to the fourth order in respective small parameters. The obtained theoretical results for the Casimir force with both corrections were confronted with the experimental data. The excellent agreement was demonstrated which is characterized by almost the same value of the root mean square deviation between theory and experiment in the cases of small and large space separations between the test bodies and in the complete measurement range.

It was shown that the agreement between the theory and experiment is substantially worse if any one of the corrections is not taken into account. What this means is that the surface roughness and finite conductivity corrections should be taken into account in precision Casimir force measurements with space separations of the order $1\,\mu\text{m}$ and less. They will also be expected to play a strong role in experimental tests of the shape and topology dependences of the Casimir force.

Further improvements in the precision can be achieved through the use of smoother metallic coatings, thinner *Au*-layers (but of enough thickness to prevent the oxidation processes of *Al*) and larger radius spheres to increase the values of force. The experimental uncertainties can be substantially reduced by use of lower temperatures to decrease the thermal noise in the AFM, and interferometric detection of cantilever deflection [32]. This will provide the opportunity to increase the accuracy of Casimir force measurements and to obtain more strong constraints on the constants of hypothetical long-range interactions and light elementary particles. Such constraints for the different ranges of Compton wavelengths of hypothetical particles were already obtained in [33] from the experiment [10] and in [34] from the experiment [12]. There is reason to hope that within the next few years the Casimir effect will become a strong competitor to the more traditional physical phenomena which can provide us with new data about long-range interactions and light elementary particles.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

G.L.K. and V.M.M are grateful to the Physics Department of the Federal University of Paraíba, where this work was partly done, for their kind hospitality.

References

- [1] H. B. G. Casimir, Proc. Kon. Nederl. Akad. Wet. **51**, 793 (1948).
- [2] G. Plunien, B. Müller, and W. Greiner, Phys. Rep. C **134**, 87 (1986).
- [3] V. M. Mostepanenko and N. N. Trunov, Sov. Phys. — Usp. (USA) **31**, 965 (1988).
- [4] P. W. Milonni, *The Quantum Vacuum*. (Academic Press, San Diego, 1994).
- [5] V. M. Mostepanenko and N. N. Trunov, *The Casimir Effect and Its Applications* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1997).
- [6] M. J. Sparnaay, Physica **24**, 751 (1958).
- [7] D. Tabor and R. H. S. Winterton, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **312**, 435 (1969).
- [8] S. Hunklinger, H. Geisselmann, and W. Arnold, Rev. Sci. Instr. **43**, 584 (1972).
- [9] P. H. G. M. van Blokland and J.T.G. Overbeek, J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. **74**, 2637 (1978).
- [10] S. K. Lamoreaux, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5 (1997); **81**, 5475 (1998).
- [11] G. L. Klimchitskaya and Yu. V. Pavlov, Int. J. Mod. Phys A **11**, 3723 (1996).
- [12] U. Mohideen and A. Roy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4549 (1998).
- [13] V. B. Bezerra, G. L. Klimchitskaya, and C. Romero, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **12**, 2613 (1997).
- [14] R. Onofrio and G. Carugno, Phys. Lett. A **198**, 365 (1995).
- [15] A. Grado, E. Calloni, and L. Di Fiore, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 042002 (1999).

- [16] V. M. Mostepanenko and I. Yu. Sokolov, Sov. Phys. Dokl. (USA) **33**, 140 (1988).
- [17] M. Bordag, G. L. Klimchitskaya, and V. M. Mostepanenko, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **10**, 2661 (1995).
- [18] W. R. Smythe, *Electrostatics and Electrodynamics* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1950).
- [19] J. L. M. J. van Bree, J. A. Poulis, B.J. Verhaar, and K. Schram, Physica **78**, 187 (1974).
- [20] M. Bordag, G. L. Klimchitskaya, and V. M. Mostepanenko, Phys. Lett. A **200**, 95 (1995).
- [21] A. A. Maradudin and P. Mazur, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 1677 (1980).
- [22] P. Mazur and A. A. Maradudin, Phys. Rev. B **23**, 695 (1981).
- [23] E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics, Part 2* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1980).
- [24] M. Schaden and L. Spruch, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 935 (1998).
- [25] L. H. Ford, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 4279 (1998).
- [26] R. Golestanian and M. Kardar, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 1713 (1998).
- [27] J. Blocki, J. Randrup, W. J. Swiatecki, and C. F. Tsang, *Ann. Phys.* **105**, 427 (1977).
- [28] *Handbook of Optical Constants of Solids*, edited by E.D. Palik (Academic Press, New York, 1985).
- [29] C. M. Hargreaves, *Proc. Kon. Nederl. Acad. Wet.* B **68**, 231 (1965).
- [30] J. Schwinger, L. L. DeRaad, Jr., and K. A. Milton, *Ann. Phys.* **115**, 1 (1978).

- [31] V. M. Mostepanenko and N. N. Trunov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. (USA)* **42**, 812 (1985).
- [32] T. Stowe, K. Yasumura, T. W. Kenny, D. Botkin, K. Wago, and D. Rugar, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **71**, 288 (1997).
- [33] M. Bordag, B. Geyer, G. L. Klimchitskaya, and V. M. Mostepanenko, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 075003 (1998).
- [34] M. Bordag, B. Geyer, G. L. Klimchitskaya, and V. M. Mostepanenko, Leipzig University Preprint, NTZ 10/1999, Leipzig, 10p.; e-print hep-ph/9902456. To appear in *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999).

List of captions

- Fig.1.** Schematic diagram of the experimental setup. Application of voltage to the piezo results in the movement of the plate towards the sphere.
- Fig.2.** A typical force curve as a function of the distance moved by the plate.
- Fig.3.** A typical Atomic Force Microscope scan of the metal surface. The lighter tone corresponds to larger height as shown by the bar graph on the left.
- Fig.4.** The measured average Casimir force for large distances as a function of plate-sphere separation is shown as open squares. The theoretical Casimir force with corrections to surface roughness and finite conductivity is shown by the solid line (when the space separation is defined as the distance between *Al* layers) and by the dashed line (with the distance between *Au/Pd* layers).
- Fig.5.** The measured average Casimir force for small distances as a function of plate-sphere separation is shown as open squares. The theoretical Casimir force with corrections to surface roughness and finite conductivity is shown by the solid line, and without any correction – by the dashed line.

This figure "figure3.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/quant-ph/9906033v1>